



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/013,645	01/26/98	HENDERSON	T PBAER36769

LM02/1202
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT
JAMES W. PAUL
10877 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TENTH FLOOR
CENTER WEST
LOS ANGELES CA 90024

EXAMINER

PHAM, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2713

DATE MAILED:

12/02/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/013,645

Applicant(s)
Thomas D. Henderson

Examiner
Ly Duy Pham

Group Art Unit
2713



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 22, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Jan 26, 1998 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 & 6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2713

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the following features must be shown:

- ✓ a. "... one video camera providing a field of view forward and downward from the aircraft's centerline, ..." (claim 1, lines 3-4),
- ✓ b. "... plurality of video images" (claim 1, line 5),
- ✓ c. "... lens that can be rotated 90 degrees providing ... 90 degrees from the normal aspect ratio orientation of the lens" (claim 3, lines 2-6),
- d. "... plurality of video cameras" (claim 4, line 2),
- e. "... auxiliary video camera" (claim 5, line 2),
- f. "... vertical fin mounted video camera directed forward ..." (claim 6, line 2)
- g. "... rearward looking belly mounted camera" (claim 7, line 2)

or they be canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2713

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson et al. and further in view of Baker et al.

Henderson et al. disclose substantially the same closed circuit television system (CCTV) for an aircraft (fig. 4; col. 5, lines 4-7), said system comprising: at least one video camera (22, 24, fig. 3) providing a field of view forward and downward from the aircraft's centerline (26, 28, fig. 7; col. 5, lines 7-15) ⁷ except having the additional features described in claim 1. However, Baker et al. show the same well-known manipulation apparatus wherein: said at least one video camera (10, fig. 1; col. 6, lines 27-31 and 52-64) generating a digital video signal (60, fig. 6; col. 12, lines 11-21) providing a plurality of video images (col. 12, lines 6-8), a plurality of video display modules (receive outputs from the RAMDACs, 78, fig. 8), and a video camera control module (80, fig. 8) connected to said at least one video camera and said plurality of video display modules for receiving said digital video signal and providing a plurality of selected video images to said plurality of video display modules, respectively. Therefore, it is considered obvious that, one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Henderson et al. and Baker et al. patents before him or her at the time the invention was made, would have had no difficulty to modify the CCTV system of Henderson et al. to include the same features as taught in Baker et al. so that a CCTV for an in-flight entertainment system can provide passengers with a capability, from his or her video frame, to individually select and/or control a desired field of view from an available multiple fields of

Art Unit: 2713

view provided by either a single video camera or multiple video cameras (Henderson et al., col. 4, lines 37-47, col. 8, lines 35-40, and Baker et al., col. 13, lines 25-31).

As per claim 2, Baker et al. also disclose the same at least one video camera providing a plurality of fields of view from a single video frame (col. 13, lines 11-19).

Regarding claim 4, Henderson et al. show a CCTV system for an aircraft comprising a plurality of video cameras (22, 24, fig. 3; col. 5, lines 7-11).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over its claimed numerical angle values, "where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to arrive at the desired numerical angle values to facilitate to one's needs through routine experimentation.

5. Claims 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson et al., Baker et al. as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Fujimoto.

Henderson et al. and Baker et al. disclose substantially the same CCTV system except having the feature described in claim 5 and 6. Nevertheless, Fujimoto shows the same well-known manipulation embodiment wherein said plurality of video cameras further comprises an

Art Unit: 2713

auxiliary video camera and wherein said auxiliary video camera comprises a vertical mounted video camera directed forward for a view of the aircraft in flight (211 or 212 or 213, fig. 28).

In regard to claim 7, the Examiner takes an Official Notice that it is obvious for one ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to manipulate the well-known auxiliary fin mounted video camera apparatus described by Fujimoto to become a rearward looking belly mounted camera as required in claim 7. Furthermore, previous court ruling has decided that shift location of parts with an apparatus is not patentable; In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Braun et al., US 5,187,571, disclose a multiple television system for displaying multiple view of a remote location, and field of view is selectable by viewers.

Hirzel, US 4,495,589, figs. 1, 2.

Jain et al., US 5,729,471, disclose sufficient information to form a 103 rejection in conjunction with Henderson et al. patent.

Ohwaki et al., US 5,801,771, fig. 14.

Ritchey, US 5,130,794, same as for Jain et al.

Scribner et al. US 5,555,466, same as above.

Art Unit: 2713

Wakai et al., US 5,973, 722, same as above.


Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Ly Pham, whose telephone number is (703) 306-5977 and e-mail is "Ly.Pham@uspto.gov". The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelly, can be reached at (703) 305-4856.

The fax number for submitting formal communications is (703) 308-9051, and for informal communications is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

L.D. Pham
11-23-1999


CHRISTOPHER S. KELLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER